

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Without acquiescing or waiving any argument concerning any other rejection of the claims, applicants request reconsideration of only the rejections of claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, and 12 by the Action in view of the amendment to claims 1 and 6.

Paragraph 1 of the Action states that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 24, 2004, fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.98(a)(2) for failure to provide a copy of listed reference EP 02 25 4886. That reference was listed in error. That reference is the application which corresponds to the instant application and for which the other references cited by the September 24, 2004 IDS were cited. Applicants apologize for any inconvenience caused by this error.

Paragraph 3 of the Action rejects claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,201,748 (Luce). As disclosed when that claim was presented, claim 13 was copied from claim 1 of United States Patent No. 6,685,589 (Horie et al.). Luce discloses a chain comprising “guard links” 8 and 13 and “regular links” 9, 10, 11, and 12. Page 1 lines 85 – 93. The guard links of Luce correspond to the guide links 22 of Horie et al. and Applicant’s guide links 22. The link plates 24 and 34 disclosed by Horie et al. each, conventionally for silent chains, define two teeth. See Fig. 2. Similarly, Applicants’ drive links 24 define conventional silent chain teeth. The preamble of claim 13, as does claim 1 of Horie et al., recites a silent chain. In contrast, Luce discloses a power transmission chain in which the regular links do not define teeth but rather are accepted between sprocket teeth that are spaced widely enough to accept the entire link between the teeth and to contact the links at the farthest extent of the link along the direction of the chain. If the preamble of claim 13 either limits the recited link plates to define conventional silent chain teeth or adds a requirement for the recited link plates to have conventional silent chain teeth, Luce does not anticipate claim 13.

Paragraph 5 of the action rejects claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Luce in view of Kozakura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,967,926). Claim 5 has been cancelled and claim 1 has been amended to include the requirements of claim 5 and to additionally require that the drive flanks on the backside of the drive links be separated by a

distance that permits the drive link to be accepted between facing surfaces of adjacent teeth of the backside sprocket. Claim 6 has been amended to include similar requirements. Luce does not disclose a chain having interleaved series of links including links forming two teeth at a front side of the link and does not disclose a chain that engages sprockets from both sides of the chain. Kozakura et al. teaches a chain that engages sprockets at both the front side and the backside of the chain, but teaches that the drive links form two teeth at both the front side and back side of the chain, i.e. teeth t at the front side and teeth t' at the back side. As is evident from Fig. 1, Kozakura et al. does not teach a chain having links that are accepted between adjacent teeth of a backside sprocket but rather that accept a tooth of the backside sprocket between teeth at opposed ends of the link and that accept a tooth of the backside sprocket between adjacent drive links.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the requirements of claim 5 that the drive links define drive flanks at opposite ends of the backside surface of the link and to additionally require that the drive flanks be separated by a distance that permits the drive flanks to contact drive surfaces of adjacent teeth of the backside drive sprocket. Similarly, claim 6 has been amended to require that drive links of the first and second series of links be positioned between adjacent teeth of the backside sprocket and that drive flanks at opposite ends of the drive links engage adjacent sprocket teeth. Luce and Kozakura et al. do not, individually or in combination teach applicants' invention as now claimed by claims 1 and 6. Claims 4, 11 and 12 depend from claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claim 8 depends from claim 6 and is allowable for at least the reasons that claim 6 is allowable.

Appl. No. 09/907,021
Amendment dated March 14, 2005

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, and in view of the amendments, the Applicants submit that the claims of this application, claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 11 and 12, are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a discussion of these claims would be useful, the Applicants request that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at (312) 775-8114. Please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven J. Hampton
Reg. No. 33,707
Attorney for Applicants

Date: March 14, 2005

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Telephone (312) 775-8000
Facsimile (312) 775-8100

Appl. No. 09/907,021
Amendment dated March 14, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

None.